

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action of April 5, 2005 (the "Office Action"), Claims 42-43, 45-46, 48-50, 52-53, 55-57, 61, 64-65, 70, and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0053979 A1 filed September 23, 1997 by Kori ("Kori"); and Claims 1-41, 44, 47, 51, 54, 58-60, 62-63, 66-69, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kori in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0097655 A1 filed November 21, 2001 by Novak ("Novak").

Claims 1 and 42 have been amended so that the registry key that is used to decrypt the secure registry is regenerated using an identification of an entity associated with the secure registry at the time of the regeneration. Support for such amendment may be found in FIGS. 6 and 7 and corresponding descriptions on starting on page 11, line 18 to page 13, line 5 of the application.

In Kori, a user management key *ku* is used to decrypt an encrypted data encryption key *kd*, which in turn, is used to decrypt encrypted A/V data. Thus, Kori's encrypted data encryption key *kd* is similar in function to applicants' secure registry, Kori's user management key *ku* is similar in function to applicants' registry key, and Kori's data encryption key *kd* is similar in function to applicants' "another key" that is stored in the secure registry. However, Kori's user management key *ku* is not regenerated in order to use it to decrypt the secure registry, as required in claims 1 and 42. Instead, it is supplied from the A/V data supplying side to the user. See, page 5, paragraph [0081] of Kori.

Similarly, in Novak, a license key is used to decrypt an encrypted access key, which in turn is used to decrypt requested content. Thus, Novak's encrypted access key is similar in function to applicants' secure registry, Novak's license key is similar in function to applicants' registry key, and Novak's access key is similar in function to applicants' "another key" that is stored in the secure registry. However, Novak's license key is not regenerated in order to use it to decrypt the secure registry, as required in claims 1 and 42. Instead, it is supplied from a verification entity to the user's set top box (STB). See, page 6, paragraphs [0092] and [0094] of Novak.

In addition, in applicants' invention, the identification of an entity that is associated with the secure registry is used in generating the registry key. Therefore, unlike Novak, applicants' invention avoids the necessity to compare an obtained identification of an entity (i.e., identity of the user) with a stored identification of the entity, as well as avoiding the need to store the identification of the entity in the first place. This is because, if the identification of a different entity is obtained, then the generated registry key using that identification would not be the same registry key used to encrypt the secure registry and consequently, the generated registry key would be unable to decrypt the secure registry. Novak, on the other hand, requires the use of a verification entity to perform this function.

Accordingly, since a regenerated registry key such as claimed in Claims 1 and 42 is neither taught nor suggested in either Kori or Novak, Claims 1 and 42, as amended, are

believed to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as well as 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kori and Novak.

Claims 2-11, 19, 24-35, 37-41, 43-56, and 66-72 are also believed to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as well as 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kori and Novak, since they depend from either Claim 1 or 42, and as such, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons as stated in reference to Claims 1 and 42.

Claims 1-11, 19, 24-35, 37-56, and 66-72 remain pending in the application. Claims 12-18, 20-23, 36, and 57-65 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejections of the pending claims is respectfully requested for the reasons stated herein, and an early notice of their allowance earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that it would expedite the processing of this case, she is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 19, 2006



Victor H. Okumoto
Registration No. 35,973
(510) 792-1112